Case J:23-cv-10616-DPH ECF No. 1, PageID.1 Filed 03/16/23 Page 1 of 17

PERRY WEITZ

BENNO ASHRAFI \$
JAMES J. BILSBORROW ††
LISA NATHANSON BUSCH ††
LISA NATHANSON BUSCH ††
CHARLES M. FERGUSON
ALANI GOLANSKI †
ROBIN L. GREENWALD §§
GARY R. KLEIN ††
JERRY KRISTAL **
ELLEN RELKIN * €£'
MICHAEL P. ROBERTS
NICHOLAS WISE **
GLENN ZUCKERMAN

ANDREW L. BACKING *
RETT BERGMARK
DEVIN BOLTON ;
ERIN M. BOYLE -ERIN M. BOYLE -BRANDIS
JOHN M. BRANDIS
JOHN M. BRANDIS
A.
PATTI BURSHTYN †
BRANDI C. CHAPLIN ¶
COURTNEY CHLEBINA -NANCY M. CHRISTENSEN ††
BENJAMIN T. CLINTON
THOMAS COMERFORD †† \$

700 BROADWAY • NEW YORK, NY 10003-9536 TEL. 212-558-5500 FAX 212-344-5461 WWW.WEITZLUX.COM

VENUS BURNS ;
TERESA A. CURTIN 11
BENJAMIN DARCHE
JUSTINE K. DELANEY
ADAM S. DREKSLER
BRANDON DUPREE ;
JASON B. DUNCAN 1
F. ALEXANDER EIDEN 1
TIFFANY R. ELLIS \$\$*
MICHAEL FANELLI ††
LEONARD F. FELDMAN 1
STUART R. FRIEDMAN 1
STUART R. FRIEDMAN 1
MARY GRABISH GAFFNEY 1
ERICARAE GARCIA **
ANDREW J. GAYOSO DIANA GJONAJ *
DANIELLE M. GOLD 11
LAWRENCE GOLDHIRSCH **
BENJAMIN GOLDMAN -NICHOLAS A. GONSALVES
ROBERT J. GORDON ††
LAURA GREEN ††
CODY M. HREEMES 1
MATTHEWA G. GRUBMAN 1
MICOLE A. HYATT
MARIE L. IANNIELLO † °
ERIK JACOBS

JEFFREY'S, KANCA ♦♦
DAVID M. KAUPMAN ††
PAULINA R. KENNEDY *
SEAN K. KERLEY Φ
CHANTAL KHALIL
ILYA KHARKOVER
JOSH KRISTAL ¶
JOSH KRISTAL ¶
JARED LAGERTOSA
DEBBI LANDAU
DANIEL C. LIPINER
JOSEPH J. MANDIA ¶
COLIN MARKEL
JAMIE MATTERA
BRENDAN A. MCDONOUGH ††
SARA MERRILL *
MICHELLE C. MURTHA ¶
MICHELLE C. MURTHA ¶
MICHELLE C. MURTHA ¶
MICHALE SOLIVA
JOSIAH W. PARKER †
MICHALE E. PEDERSON
BRANDON H. PERLMAN
JAMES A. PLASTIRAS ††
ADAM C. RAFFO
PIERRE RATZKI

CHRIS ROMANELLI ††
KYLE A SCHIEDO Y
JARED SCOTTO
BHARATI O. SHARMA ¶
CALLIE M. SHARP §\$
ALEXANDRA SHEF i
EDUARDO R. SOTOMAYOR ††
SAMANTHA E. STAHL
GREGORY STAMATOPOULOS*
TYLER R. STOCK i
PETER TAMBINI ††
JAMES S. THOMPSON ††
BENJAMIN VANSLYKE *
CASEY THAL VERVILLE &
JASON M. WEINER ×
JASON P. WEINSTEIN
LAUREN A. WEITZ
MARK WEITZ
MARK WEITZ
MAYNE A. WILLIAMS *

Admitted only in NJ,PA & WV

Admitted only in OR & MI

× Also admitted in DC & MO

+ Also admitted in NJ & CT

Also admitted in NJ & DC

¶ Also admitted in NJ & DC

¶ Also admitted in NJ & ME

- Also admitted in NJ & MI

• Also admitted in NJ & WI

A Also admitted in NJ & WV

A loo admitted in NJ & WV

A loo admitted in DC, II, MO, NJ & PA

A & Also admitted in DC, II, MO, NJ & PA

* Of Counsel

§§ Admitted only in IL

& Admitted only in I A

* Admitted only in MI

~ Admitted only in PA Δ∆ Also admitted in CA MAlso admitted in CO

Also admitted in FL

♦ Also admitted in MA

†† Also admitted in NJ × Also admitted in PA

Φ Also admitted in SC ~ Also admitted in WI

Admitted only in CA & UT Admitted only in CA, PA & W

¶ Admitted only in NJ & PA

March 3, 2023

Via Federal Express:

US District Court of Eastern Michigan Judge Denise Page Hood 231 W Lafayette Blvd., Room 251 Detroit, MI 48226

Notice of Appeal for Attached Client List Decision of Lien Judge

Dear Judge Hood:

Our firm previously filed attorney liens for the 70 Claimants at issue herein in August and September of 2022 for reimbursement of our attorney's fees and expenses. See, the attached list of Claimants' Premium Payments related to their Claims. On February 21, 2023, we were advised that our claims for reimbursement were denied due to an alleged failure to include a reason why we could not distribute the claimant's payment's directly to the claimant (see attached decision of the Lien Judge). Apparently, the explanation we provided was not sufficiently detailed, despite working on these files for almost thirty years and keeping a full-time attorney and staff members working on these cases for that whole time. Moreover, it should be noted that on a previous lien request for Claimant, Lee Ann Reinwald-Lagge SID#: 1352746 we had been admonished for putting in too much detail about our efforts on behalf of the client. Clearly our efforts to obtain compensation for

220 LAKE DRIVE EAST, SUITE 210 • CHERRY HILL, NJ 08002 • TEL 856-755-1115
1880 CENTURY PARK EAST, SUITE 700 • LOS ANGELES, CA 90067 • TEL 310-247-0921
3011WEST GRAND BLVD., 24TH FLOOR • DETROIT, MI 48202 • TEL 313-800-4170
1983 MARCUS AVENUE, SUITE 104 • LAKE SUCCESS, NY 11042 • TEL 516-861-8500



Page 2 Notice of Appeal

our clients were not appreciated nor did the Lien Judge appear to consider our efforts worthy of compensation.

What is most upsetting is that over the years that various Claims Administrators have sent other firms clients (firms went out of business) or individual unrepresented clients to us, so that we could help them through the claims process. To imply that we were not sufficiently diligent in our efforts to get our clients paid and thus are not entitled to a recovery for our efforts is most disappointing. We respectfully request a reversal of this decision to deny our attorney lien.

Starting in 1992 our firm began to work diligently on these files to obtain our clients Proof of Manufacturer documents for both the Revised Settlement (RSP) and Dow Corning Settlement Plans. We also scheduled and paid for their appointment with Expert Doctors, whose reports qualified these clients for compensation under the Revised Settlement and Dow Corning Settlement plans. We also ordered and paid for supportive medical records for their Disease Claim submissions.

Having filed and supplied all of the relevant forms and paperwork for our clients' Disease and Rupture claims we then awaited the SFDCT's decision on the acceptability of our clients' proof of their claims. If approved, we proceeded to distribute their settlements and if not we worked on collecting sufficient documentation to cure any deficiency in the claim. These claims started to be approved in 2004-2005 and settlement payments started to come into our office. These payments required individual discussions with each of these clients to establish their current mailing addresses and proper payment instructions on their settlement checks. Not surprisingly, when these settlement payments were being distributed, we needed to confirm our clients' mailing addresses and payment information, since the initial filing of their claims a number of our clients had become divorced, widowed or remarried and some had passed away and thus the name we needed to put on their settlement checks could have changed. This required a tremendous amount of work to clear any liens and to make sure our clients were timely paid. It was also during this process that we took another opportunity to request alternative contact information from our clients, should we be unable to reach them in the future. All of the clients on the attached list received their base Disease and if applicable Rupture payments.

Another ten years passed before the distribution of the First Premium payments began. However, during that time period we maintained contact with our clients, responded to their inquiries and kept them up to date on the progress of the litigation. Once the First Premium payments began to come in, we again reached out to our clients to have individual discussions with each of these clients to establish their current mailing addresses and proper payment instructions on their settlement checks. To complicate matters further, it was often during these discussions or in response to our letters or e-mails that we were first made aware of the client's passing. Once we became aware of the death of the claimant it was our practice to reach out to the surviving family members to have them supply us with the proper Estate paperwork that must be submitted in order for the claim to resolved. That process is always very stressful, as you are often working with individuals who may have had no idea that their loved one had a claim, and often such discussions

Page 3 Notice of Appeal

bring up painful memories related to the loss of their loved one. Getting someone to step forward to take responsibility to set up an Estate requires a lot of time on the phone with various family members, and in the end, it can still result in nobody from the family being interested in moving forward despite our best efforts. That is what happened with all the clients at issue herein. Either no family member was willing to assist us in setting up an Estate (not interested, too expensive or not worth doing) or we simply could not get someone to respond to our calls and letters or we simply could not find anyone to work with. When we submit our letter brief, we will set forth in greater detail our efforts to contact and ultimately pay the clients that we are seeking payment on for our attorney liens.

We respectfully request that that the lien Judges decision be revered, and our liens upheld, as we spent several years prepping these cases for submission (all their Disease and Rupture claims were approved). As a result of these efforts, the client received approval for compensation in the Dow Corning Plan as well as approval of their Premium payments. The problem here is that we simply can't get a family member to work with us, and that should not be a reason why our lien is denied.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Please advise us as to when our letter brief will be due. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (212) 558-5591 or (917) 749-4731.

Very Truly Yours,

WEITZ & LUXENBERG, P.C.,

By: ///

Michael Pederson, Esq.

Enclosures

cc: Settlement Facility-Dow Corning Trust; via Fedex & E-mail

		11/01 //		
ID	SIDNum	W&L#	LNAME	FNAME
1	1051577		KAUFFMAN	ROBERTA K.
2	1051889		LIPMAN	MAUREEN ANITA
3	1052920		WALTER	LURENA
4	1070641		WILLS	MIRIAM (MARIE)
5	1282123		CURTIN	KIM
6	6149699	36699		TSILLA
7	245625		VANDERSALL	SHIRLEY
8	323025		VOGEL	ARLENE
9	1008052		DOWD	KATHLEEN
10	1051922	31387	PRICE	JEAN
11	1052125		HERION	SARAH
12	1052223	33027	VASTANO	MARY ANN
13	1052863	31531	FORD	DORIS L.
14	1053158	30580	PHILLIPS	BARBARA
15	1070646	31308	HEMINGWAY-MASON	LAWANDA FAYE
16	1105991	30885	DALE	ADELE
17	1106040	32868	DAVIS	MARY ELIZABETH
18	1106179	34043	BRUGGER	EVELYN ELIZABETH
19	1106320	34062	CHURCHILL	JUDITH K.
20	1106391	30030	BROOKS	ZELDA
21	1106398	34516	DIMIN	HELENE
22	1106689	31722	DOWDLE	SHIRLEY
23	1106748	35051	DONALDSON	MARGARET JOANNA
24	1106868	33342	REYNOLDS	KATHY
25	1106872		SCHULLERMAN	RITA
26	1107008	31716		JOAN
27	1107038		JONES	STARLET LACEY
28	1107052		POTESTIO	LISA
29	1107096		RUGGIERO	LYLA ANN
30	1107203		SCHULTZ	FREDA
31	1107253		JOHNSON	PATRICIA JULIA
32	1107263		KOWADLO	BONNIE F.
33	1107680		TRAVERS	JOAN
34	1107567		GLATZEL	EVANGELINA
35	1107790		MORROW	SANDRA
36	1118666	32134		MARY ANNA
37	1119343		KOSTELNIK	CHERYL
38	1119483		HARRISON	SLAVICA
39	1120307		BOWLIN	CAROL
40	1135709		MERCURIO	PATRICIA
41	1136680		SWALLEY	JO ANN
42	1135722		NATIONS	BEVERLY
43	1139323		COOPER	CAROLYN
44	1218122		CARLON	NONA L.
45 46	1218231		FOSTER	MARY ANN
46	1218309	350/5	FRANK	DORIS GODDARD

	SIDNum	W&L#	LNAME	FNAME
47	1218393		OSBORNE	TAMRA
48	1226730	33452	MCWRIGHT	BARBARA E.F.
49	1229036	31970	NEWTON	SHARON
50	1228337	34252	BUCKLEY	SHARON J.
51	1229264	31214	FISHER	EDITH IRENE
52	1229631	35501	DERIENZO	SUSAN
53	1261187	32953	REYES	JOHANNA E
54	1263362	30625	FREEMAN	JUNE SYLVIA
55	1308119	30828	MYERS	DRAXIE N.
56	1312387	35023	CANAKARIS	GEORGIA
57	1352798	30458	WINOWSKY	MARIELLA
58	1352805	32482	YUNIS	LYNNE H.
59	1371744	34850	PHELPS	MARGARET
60	1376656	33528	WALL	ANN
61	1462188	32705	MCGUIRE-GONZALES	COLLEEN KAY
62	2788307	30595	JONES	MARY ANNA
63	6124719	35957	DELEO-BARLOW	MARY
64	6182350	35984	HARRISON	ELIZABETH
65	6300887	36753	PERKINS	JUNE
66	6342252	36791	SEMMEL	SHELLEY
68	6368154	36053	SWAIM	MAXINE LOUISE
69	1263352	35628	JANSSEN	DIANNA
70	1106971	34867	PINK	VERNA

P.O. Box 52429 Houston, Texas 77052

TELEPHONE 713.874.6099 866.874.6099

February 21, 2023

WEITZ & LUXENBERG P.C. 700 BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10003-9536 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

RE: LIEN JUDGE DECISION

See Attached

FedEx # 8168 9603 2830

The Settlement Facility – Dow Corning Trust (SF-DCT) has received a decision from the Lien Judge regarding your lien dispute. A copy of the decision is attached for your review.

Section 7.01 of the "Procedures For The Review of Asserted Liens Against Settling Implant Claimants" provides that: "Either party may appeal the decision of the Lien Judge by filing a Notice of Appeal with the District Court within 14 days of the date of the notice from SF-DCT providing the decision of the Lien Judge."

If you wish to appeal the decision of the Lien Judge you <u>must</u> file the appeal with the District Court and THE SF-DCT within 14 days from the date of this letter. If the SF-DCT does not receive a notice of appeal within 14 days, payment will be issued according to the Lien Judge's decision.

The address to submit the appeal to the District Court is:

United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan
Judge Denise Page Hood
231 West Lafayette Blvd. Room 251
Detroit, MI 48226

Sincerely,

Settlement Facility – Dow Corning Trust Enclosures: Lien Judge Decision

IN RE:

114 T.L.					
File No.	Claimant	SID No.	File No.	Claimant	SID No.
22-854	Shirley Vandersall	0245625	22-923	Frances Johnson	1119426
22-857	Arlene Vogel	0323025	22-924	Slavica Harrison	1119483
22-858	Kathleen Dowd	1008052	22-925	Carol Bowlin	1120307
22-863	Jean Price	1051922	22-926	Patricia Mercurio	1135709
22-864	Sarah Herion	1052125	22-927	Jo Ann Swalley	1136680
22-866	Mary Vastano	1052223	22-928	Beverly Nations	1135722
22-871	Doris Ford	1052863	22-930	Carolyn Cooper	1139323
22-873	Barbara Phillips	1053158	22-936	Nona L Carlon	1218122
22-879	Lawanda Hemingway-Mason	1070646	22-938	Maryann Foster	1218231
22-882	Adele Dale	1105991	22-940	Doris Frank	1218309
22-884	Mary Elizabeth Davis	1106040	22-942	Tamra Osborne	1218393
22-886	Evelyn Brugger	1106179	22-945	Barbara McWright	1226730
22-887	Betty Bruce	1106181	22-947	Sharon Newton	1229036
22-889	Judith Churchill	1106320	22-948	Sharon Buckley	1228337
22-890	Zelda Brooks	1106391	22-950	Edith Fisher	1229264
22-891	Helene Dimin	1106398	22-952	Susan DeRienzo	1229631
22-894	Shirley Dowdle	1106689	22-955	Johanna E Reyes	1261187
22-895	Margaret Donaldson	1106748	22-958	June Sylvia Freeman	1263362
22-897	Kathy Reynolds	1106868	22-967	Draxie Myers	1308119
22-898	Rita Inez Schullerman	1106872	22-968	Georgia Canakaris	1312387
22-902	Joan Rea	1107008	22-973	Mariella Winowsky	1352798
22-904	Starlet Jones	1107038	22-974	Lynn Yunis	1352805
22-905	Lisa Potestio	1107052	22-976	Margaret Phelps	1371744
22-906	Lyla Ruggiero	1107096	22-977	Ann Wall	1376656
22-907	Freda Schultz	1107203	22-979	Colleen Gonzales	1462188
22-909	Patricia J Johnson	1107253	22-982	Mary A Jones	2788307
22-910	Bonnie F Kowaldo	1107263	22-986	Mary C Barlow Deleo	6124719
22-914	Joan Travers	1107680	22-988	Elizabeth Harrison	6182350
22-915	Evangelina Glatzel	1107567	22-989	June Perkins	6300887
22-917	Sandra Morrow	1107790	22-990	Shirley Semmel	6342252
22-919	Mary Anna Leslie	1118666	22-991	Maxine Louise Swaim	6368154
22-922	Cheryl Kostelnik	1119343	22-992	Dianna Janssen	1263352
			22-1014	Verna Pink	1106971

DETERMINATION DENYING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES AND EXPENSES

An Order captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling Implant Claimants"

entered by Hon. Denise Page Hood on April 13, 2018 allowed Attorneys of Record ("AOR") to file a Proof of Lien ("POL") form to recover fees and expenses against approved claims even though the Claimant, or her estate, were currently unwilling or unavailable to receive payment. §6.07

There is however, a requirement for AORs to receive Trust funds In this situation. The POL form attached to the Order requires the AOR to sign "under penalty of perjury" that in "asserting a lien...because you either cannot locate your client to distribute a payment or are unable to distribute a payment because the claimant is deceased" to attest "(o)n a separate piece of paper," a description of "the efforts you have taken to locate your client, the last known address and contact information for the client and/or any contact information for heirs and/or probate administrators and representatives, if applicable. The statement must include a reason why you cannot distribute the claimant's payments directly to the claimant."

To date, Weitz & Luxenberg has filed 140 POL forms seeking fees and expenses under this section of the form. As to 65 claims, the complete explanation for being unable to compensate its client is as follows:

Attached are liens for the Claimants listed below, the families have decided not to pursue the Estate, as the cost of setting up the Estate exceeds the settlement amount or the established Representatives have failed to keep an open line of communications with our office. Despite numerous attempts, we have been unable to locate them. Thank you.

A simple reading of the language of the form advises that the information to be provided must relate to the individual circumstances of the Claimant, i.e. an address, contact information, and heirs is listed; something specific to each Claimant, such as a date of death if the Claimant is deceased.

Weitz & Luxenberg's statement appears to apply to any deceased client whose heirs have been in contact with the firm, OR, representatives who failed to contact the firm. This explanation is in the alternative. The POL requires a statement of what the firm did, not what the Claimant failed to do.

The POL failed to specify the information and efforts taken to comply with this requirement. "Numerous attempts" is a conclusionary statement that does not fulfill the requirement for a lien payment in the absence of payment to the Claimant or her estate.

For this reason, the liens requested are denied.

Dated: February 17, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

IN RE:

File No.	Claimant	SID No.
22-860	Roberta Kaufman	1051577
22-861	Maureen Lipman	1051889
22-870	Lurena Walter	1052920
22-878	Miriam Wills	1070641
22-962	Kim Curtin	1282123
22-987	Tsilla Flint	6149699

DETERMINATION DENYING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES AND EXPENSES

An Order captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling Implant Claimants" entered by Hon. Denise Page Hood on April 13, 2018 allowed Attorneys of Record ("AOR") to file a Proof of Lien ("POL") form to recover fees and expenses against approved claims even though the Claimant, or her estate, were currently unwilling or unavailable to receive payment. §6.07

There is however, a requirement for AORs to receive Trust funds in this situation. The POL form attached to the Order requires the AOR to sign "under penalty of perjury" that in "asserting a lien...because you either cannot locate your client to distribute a payment or are unable to distribute a payment because the claimant is deceased" to attest "(o)n a separate piece of paper," a description of "the efforts you have taken to locate your client, the last known address and contact information for the client and/or any contact information for heirs and/or probate administrators and representatives, if applicable. The statement must include a reason why you cannot distribute the claimant's payments directly to the claimant."

The POL forms filed for the above captioned Claimants did not include a statement required by the form.

For this reason, the liens requested are denied.

Dated: February 17, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

IN RE: Marcia McMillen S.I.D. 0241596 File No. 22-853

DETERMINATION GRANTING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES AND DENYING LIEN FOR EXPENSES

Weitz and Luxenberg ("Weitz') filed a Proof of Lien Form against funds held by the SF-DCT for Claimant's Disease Premium Payment (\$1,000). The Weitz lien is for attorney fees and expenses. Weitz has represented Claimant since 2003.

Lien disputes are governed by the Orders of the Court and governing documents.¹

Based on the Schedule in the Plan, 5.10.1 and Annex A, 9.0, \$225.00 is allowable for attorney fees. It should be noted that the Premium Payment benefit is a direct result of the representation by Weitz that led to the previous award for Disease benefits. For this reason, Weitz's \$ 225.00 lien for attorney fees is allowed.

The cost ledger submitted for expenses lists a \$4.00 unallowable expense for certified mail. July 22, 2004 Order, Exhibit 1. For this reason, the \$4.00 lien for expenses is denied.

Dated: February 17, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

¹ Article 5.10 of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization ("Plan") as updated June 1, 2004; Article 9.01 and 9.02 of Annex A to the Settlement Facility and Fund Distribution Agreement ("SFA") between Dow Corning Corporation and the Claimants' Advisory Committee; Questions and Answers contained in Claimant Information Guide for Class 5 Breast Implant Claims ("Guide"); Order of the District Court dated July 22, 2004 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; Order of the District Court dated May 23, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures; Order of the District Court dated October 6, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; On December 3, 2015, Chief Judge Denise Page Hood entered the Consent Order To Establish Guidelines For Distributions From The Class 7 Silicone Material Claimants' Fund. It restates Section 6.04(h)(v) of Annex A to the SFA; December 27, 2017 Order of the U.S. District Court to pay Partial Second Priority Payments was affirmed by a ruling of the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals on December 13, 2018; Order of the District Court dated April 13, 2018 captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling (Implant Claimants."

IN RE: Terrie Spano S.I.D. 0252239 File No. 22-855

DETERMINATION GRANTING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES

Weitz and Luxenberg ("Weitz") filed a Proof of Lien form against funds held by the SF-DCT for Claimant's Disease Premium Payment (\$2,000) and Rupture Premium Payment (\$2,500). The lien is for attorney fees. Weitz has represented Claimant since 2002.

Lien disputes are governed by the Orders of the Court and governing documents.¹

Based on the Schedule in the Plan, §5.10.1 and Annex A, §9.01(a), \$1,012.50 is allowable for attorney fees. It should be noted that the Premium Payment benefits are a direct result of the representation by Weitz that led to the previous award for Disease and Rupture benefits. For this reason, a \$1,012.50 lien for attorney fees is allowed.

Dated: February 17, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

¹ Article 5.10 of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization ("Plan") as updated June 1, 2004; Article 9.01 and 9.02 of Annex A to the Settlement Facility and Fund Distribution Agreement ("SFA") between Dow Corning Corporation and the Claimants' Advisory Committee; Questions and Answers contained in Claimant Information Guide for Class 5 Breast Implant Claims ("Guide"); Order of the District Court dated July 22, 2004 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; Order of the District Court dated May 23, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures, Order of the District Court dated October 6, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; On December 3, 2015, Chief Judge Denise Page Hood entered the Consent Order To Establish Guidelines For Distributions From The Class 7 Silicone Material Claimants' Fund. It restates Section 6.04(h)(v) of Annex A to the SFA; December 27, 2017 Order of the U.S. District Court to pay Partial Second Priority Payments was affirmed by a ruling of the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals on December 13, 2018; Order of the District Court dated April 13, 2018 captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling Implant Claimants."

IN RE: Ellen Ray S.I.D. 0277012 File No. 22-856

DETERMINATION GRANTING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES

Weitz and Luxenberg ("Weitz") filed a Proof of Lien form against funds held by the SF-DCT for Claimant's Disease Premium Payment (\$2,000). The lien is for attorney fees. Weitz has represented Claimant since 1997.

Lien disputes are governed by the Orders of the Court and governing documents.¹

Based on the Schedule in the Plan, §5.10.1 and Annex A, §9.01(a), \$225.00 is allowable for attorney fees. It should be noted that the Premium Payment benefit is a direct result of the representation by Weitz that led to the previous award for Disease benefits. For this reason, a \$225.00 lien for attorney fees is allowed.

Dated: February 17, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

Pamela R. Haswood

¹ Article 5.10 of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization ("Plan") as updated June 1, 2004; Article 9.01 and 9.02 of Annex A to the Settlement Facility and Fund Distribution Agreement ("SFA") between Dow Corning Corporation and the Claimants' Advisory Committee; Questions and Answers contained in Claimant Information Guide for Class 5 Breast Implant Claims ("Guide"); Order of the District Court dated July 22, 2004 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; Order of the District Court dated May 23, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures; Order of the District Court dated October 6, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; On December 3, 2015, Chief Judge Denise Page Hood entered the Consent Order To Establish Guidelines For Distributions From The Class 7 Silicone Material Claimants' Fund. It restates Section 6.04(h)(v) of Annex A to the SFA; December 27, 2017 Order of the U.S. District Court to pay Partial Second Priority Payments was affirmed by a ruling of the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals on December 13, 2018; Order of the District Court dated April 13, 2018 captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling Implant Claimants."

IN RE: Rosemarie Sloane S.I.D. 1051839 File No. 22-859

DETERMINATION GRANTING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES

Weitz and Luxenberg ("Weitz") filed a Proof of Lien form against funds held by the SF-DCT for Claimant's Disease Premium Payment (\$500) and Rupture Premium Payment (\$2,500). The lien is for attorney fees. Weitz has represented Claimant since 1992.

Lien disputes are governed by the Orders of the Court and governing documents.¹

Based on the Schedule in the Plan, §5.10.1 and Annex A, §9.01(a), \$675.00 is allowable for attorney fees. It should be noted that the Premium Payment benefits are a direct result of the representation by Weitz that led to the previous award for Disease and Rupture benefits. For this reason, a \$675.00 lien for attorney fees is allowed.

Dated: February 16, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

¹ Article 5.10 of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization ("Plan") as updated June 1, 2004; Article 9.01 and 9.02 of Annex A to the Settlement Facility and Fund Distribution Agreement ("SFA") between Dow Corning Corporation and the Claimants' Advisory Committee; Questions and Answers contained in Claimant Information Guide for Class 5 Breast Implant Claims ("Guide"); Order of the District Court dated July 22, 2004 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; Order of the District Court dated May 23, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures; Order of the District Court dated October 6, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; On December 3, 2015, Chief Judge Denise Page Hood entered the Consent Order To Establish Guidelines For Distributions From The Class 7 Silicone Material Claimants' Fund. It restates Section 6.04(h)(v) of Annex A to the SFA; December 27, 2017 Order of the U.S. District Court to pay Partial Second Priority Payments was affirmed by a ruling of the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals on December 13, 2018; Order of the District Court dated April 13, 2018 captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling Implant Claimants."

IN RE: Janice Linssen S.I.D. 1051891 File No. 22-862

DETERMINATION GRANTING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES

Weitz and Luxenberg ("Weitz") filed a Proof of Lien form against funds held by the SF-DCT for Claimant's Disease Premium Payment (\$1,000). The lien is for attorney fees. Weitz has represented Claimant since 1993.

Lien disputes are governed by the Orders of the Court and governing documents.¹

Based on the Schedule in the Plan, §5.10.1 and Annex A, §9.01(a), \$225.00 is allowable for attorney fees. It should be noted that the Premium Payment benefit is a direct result of the representation by Weitz that led to the previous award for Disease benefits. For this reason, a \$225.00 lien for attorney fees is allowed.

Dated: February 16, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

¹ Article 5.10 of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization ("Plan") as updated June 1, 2004; Article 9.01 and 9 02 of Annex A to the Settlement Facility and Fund Distribution Agreement ("SFA") between Dow Corning Corporation and the Claimants' Advisory Committee; Questions and Answers contained in Claimant Information Guide for Class 5 Breast Implant Claims ("Guide"); Order of the District Court dated July 22, 2004 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; Order of the District Court dated May 23, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures; Order of the District Court dated October 6, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; On December 3, 2015, Chief Judge Denise Page Hood entered the Consent Order To Establish Guidelines For Distributions From The Class 7 Silicone Material Claimants' Fund. It restates Section 6.04(h)(v) of Annex A to the SFA; December 27, 2017 Order of the U.S. District Court to pay Partial Second Priority Payments was affirmed by a ruling of the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals on December 13, 2018; Order of the District Court dated April 13, 2018 captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling Implant Claimants."

IN RE: Maryjane Querio S.I.D. 1052128 File No. 22-865

DETERMINATION GRANTING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES

Weitz and Luxenberg ("Weitz") filed a Proof of Lien form against funds held by the SF-DCT for Claimant's Disease Premium Payment (\$1,000). The lien is for attorney fees. Weitz has represented Claimant since 1994.

Lien disputes are governed by the Orders of the Court and governing documents.¹

Based on the Schedule in the Plan, §5.10.1 and Annex A, §9.01(a), \$225.00 is allowable for attorney fees. It should be noted that the Premium Payment benefit is a direct result of the representation by Weitz that led to the previous award for Disease benefits. For this reason, a \$225.00 lien for attorney fees is allowed.

Dated: February 16, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

¹ Article 5.10 of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization ("Plan") as updated June 1, 2004; Article 9.01 and 9.02 of Annex A to the Settlement Facility and Fund Distribution Agreement ("SFA") between Dow Corning Corporation and the Claimants' Advisory Committee; Questions and Answers contained in Claimant Information Guide for Class 5 Breast Implant Claims ("Guide"); Order of the District Court dated July 22, 2004 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; Order of the District Court dated May 23, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures; Order of the District Court dated October 6, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; On December 3, 2015, Chief Judge Denise Page Hood entered the Consent Order To Establish Guidelines For Distributions From The Class 7 Silicone Material Claimants' Fund. It restates Section 6.04(h)(v) of Annex A to the SFA; December 27, 2017 Order of the U.S. District Court to pay Partial Second Priority Payments was affirmed by a ruling of the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals on December 13, 2018; Order of the District Court dated April 13, 2018 captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling Implant Claimants."

IN RE: Paula Mall S.I.D. 1052432 File No. 22-867

DETERMINATION GRANTING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES

Weitz and Luxenberg ("Weitz") filed a Proof of Lien form against funds held by the SF-DCT for Claimant's Disease Premium Payment (\$2,000). The lien is for attorney fees. Weitz has represented Claimant since 1993.

Lien disputes are governed by the Orders of the Court and governing documents.¹

Based on the Schedule in the Plan, §5.10.1 and Annex A, §9.01(a), \$450.00 is allowable for attorney fees. It should be noted that the Premium Payment benefit is a direct result of the representation by Weitz that led to the previous award for Disease benefits. For this reason, a \$450.00 lien for attorney fees is allowed.

Dated: February 16, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

Pamela R. Horwood

¹ Article 5.10 of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization ("Plan") as updated June 1, 2004; Article 9.01 and 9.02 of Annex A to the Settlement Facility and Fund Distribution Agreement ("SFA") between Dow Corning Corporation and the Claimants' Advisory Committee; Questions and Answers contained in Claimant Information Guide for Class 5 Breast Implant Claims ("Guide"); Order of the District Court dated July 22, 2004 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; Order of the District Court dated May 23, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures; Order of the District Court dated October 6, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; On December 3, 2015, Chief Judge Denise Page Hood entered the Consent Order To Establish Guidelines For Distributions From The Class 7 Silicone Material Claimants' Fund. It restates Section 6.04(h)(v) of Annex A to the SFA; December 27, 2017 Order of the U.S. District Court to pay Partial Second Priority Payments was affirmed by a ruling of the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals on December 13, 2018; Order of the District Court dated April 13, 2018 captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling Implant Claimants."

IN RE: Joyce Freireich S.I.D. 1052654 File No. 22-868

DETERMINATION GRANTING LIEN FOR ATTORNEY FEES AND DENYING LIEN FOR EXPENSES

Weitz and Luxenberg ("Weitz') filed a Proof of Lien Form against funds held by the SF-DCT for Claimant's Disease Premium Payment (\$1,000). The Weitz lien is for attorney fees and expenses. Weitz has represented Claimant since 1992.

Lien disputes are governed by the Orders of the Court and governing documents.¹

Based on the Schedule in the Plan, 5.10.1 and Annex A, 9.0, \$450.00 is allowable for attorney fees. It should be noted that the Premium Payment benefit is a direct result of the representation by Weitz that led to the previous award for Disease benefits. For this reason, Weitz's \$450.00 lien for attorney fees is allowed.

The cost ledger submitted for expenses lists a \$4.00 unallowable expense for certified mail. July 22, 2004 Order, Exhibit 1. For this reason, the \$4.00 lien for expenses is denied.

Dated: February 16, 2023

Pamela R. Harwood, Lien Judge

¹ Article 5.10 of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization ("Plan") as updated June 1, 2004; Article 9.01 and 9.02 of Annex A to the Settlement Facility and Fund Distribution Agreement ("SFA") between Dow Corning Corporation and the Claimants' Advisory Committee; Questions and Answers contained in Claimant Information Guide for Class 5 Breast Implant Claims ("Guide"); Order of the District Court dated July 22, 2004 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; Order of the District Court dated May 23, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures; Order of the District Court dated October 6, 2005 captioned "Agreed Order Adopting Additional Q&A Pursuant to Article IX of Annex A, The Claims Resolution Procedures"; On December 3, 2015, Chief Judge Denise Page Hood entered the Consent Order To Establish Guidelines For Distributions From The Class 7 Silicone Material Claimants' Fund. It restates Section 6.04(h)(v) of Annex A to the SFA; December 27, 2017 Order of the U.S. District Court to pay Partial Second Priority Payments was affirmed by a ruling of the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals on December 13, 2018; Order of the District Court dated April 13, 2018 captioned "Amended Stipulation and Order Establishing Procedures for the Review of Asserted Liens against Settling Implant Claimants."